



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,821	12/19/2001	Denis Proulx	1400.1374890	9507
25697 7590 07/24/2007 ROSS D. SNYDER & ASSOCIATES, INC. PO BOX 164075 AUSTIN, TX 78716-4075			EXAMINER KE, PENG	
			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/24/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/027,821

Applicant(s)

PROULX ET AL.

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 4/26/07.

This action is made final.

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 9 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, and 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen US Patent 5,838,907.

As per claim 1, Hansen teaches a network administration method for provisioning logical configuration links for at least two network devices through a dedicated graphical user interface form, the method comprising:

Selecting a network device having at least one network interface through the dedicated graphical user interface form; (figure 3b, column 15, lines 18-32; To configure a device, the device must be selected first)

Determining local interface and next neighbor information for the network device; (figure 7, items 114, 116, 120, 126, 122, 118, and 124)

Determining whether the local interface and next neighbor information is associated with a logical configuration link stored among a plurality of logical configuration links in a logical link database; (column 5, lines 35-65; Subsystem is a logical link database)

Art Unit: 2174

Creating a new logical configuration link when the local interface and next neighbor information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links in the logical link databases; (column 15, lines 30-50; Unconnected PCI slot are unassociated connection)

Storing the new logical configuration link in the logical link database; (column 13, lines 10-30)

Validating the new logical configuration link; (column 13, lines 10-30)

Sending the new logical configuration link to the network device; (column 14, lines 41-60) and

Displaying a graphical representation of the new logical configuration link on a display device. (column 14, lines 41-60)

As per claim 2, Hansen teaches the method of claim 1. Hansen further teaches the step of creating a new logical configuration link further comprises the steps of ;

Selecting a link type; (column 13, lines 1-10; x. 25, frame relay, PPP and HDLC are link types)

Selecting a link numbering type for the new logical configuration link; (column 11, lines 13-30; PCI slots are numbered configuration links)

Selecting a link application for the new logical configuration link; (column 14, lines 5-25; The script commands are applications; column 13, lines 65-column 14, lines 5)

Selecting a sub layer interface type for the new logical configuration link; (column 14, lines 15-25; Connection identifiers are configuration links)

Creating a first endpoint for the new logical configuration link; and

Art Unit: 2174

Creating a second endpoint for the new logical configuration link.(column 13, lines 10-30)

As per claim 3, Hansen teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the step of selecting the link type further comprises the step of:

Selecting the link type from among a group consisting of: point-to-point, point-to-IP, and pint-to-subnet. (column 13, lines 1-10; x. 25, frame relay, PPP and HDLC)

As per claim 4, Hansen teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the step of selecting the a link number type further comprises the step of:

Selecting the link numbering type from a group consisting of: a numbered type and an un-number type. (column 11, lines 13-30; PCI slots are numbering type, column 13, lines 28-45; a list of connection interface is un-number type)

As per claim 7, Hansen teaches the method of claim 1, Hansen further teaches the step of:
Modifying a logical configuration link in the logical link databases. (column 11, lines 41-53; Editing is modifying)

As per claim 8, Hansen teaches the method of claim 1, Hansen further teaches the step of:
Deleting a logical configuration link in the logical link database. (column 10, lines 1-20)

As per claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 1. Supra.

As per claim 10, Hansen teaches the apparatus of claim 9. Hansen teaches wherein the display device provides an ability to select a network device having at least one network

Art Unit: 2174

interface through the graphical user interface form. (figure 3b, column 15, lines 18-32; To configure a device, the device must be selected first)

As per claim 11, Hansen teaches the apparatus of claim 9, Hansen further teaches the processing system determines local interface and next neighbor information for the network device. (figure 7, items 114, 116, 120, 126, 122, 118, and 124)

As per claim 12, Hansen teaches the apparatus of claim 11, Hansen further teaches the processing system determines whether the local interface and next neighbor information is associated with one of the logical configuration links stored in the logical link database. (column 15, lines 30-50; Unconnected PCI slot are unassociated connection)

As per claim 13, Hansen teaches the apparatus of claim 12, Hansen further teaches creates a new logical configuration link when the local interface and next neighbor information is not associate with any of the logical configuration links stored in the logical link database. (column 13, lines 10-30)

As per claim 14, Hansen teaches the apparatus of claim 13, Hansen further teaches the processing system causes the new logical configuration link to be stored in the logical link database. (column 13, lines 10-30)

As per claim 15, Hansen teaches the apparatus of claim 14, Hansen further teaches the processing system validates the new logical configuration link. (column 13, lines 10-30)

As per claim 16, Hansen teaches the apparatus of claim 15, Hansen further teaches the processing system cause the new logical configuration link to be sent to the network device. (column 14, lines 41-60)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Hansen US Patent 5,838,907 in view of Hardwick US Patent 5,550,816.

As per claim 5, Hansen teaches the method of claim 2. Hansen fails to teach the step of selecting a link application from a group consisting of:

Internet Protocol Forwarding, Multi-Protocol Label Switching and Internet Protocol Forwarding, and Multi-Protocol Label Switching.

Hardwick teaches the step of selecting a link application from a group consisting of:

Internet Protocol Forwarding, Multi-Protocol Label Switching and Internet Protocol Forwarding, and Multi-Protocol Label Switching. (column 43, lines 60- column 44, lines 5)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Hardwick's teaching with method of Hansen in order to provide a wide variety of access control tools that permit network managers to define the policy of how network group can interact within themselves.

Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Hansen US Patent 5,838,907 in view of Chui US Patent 2002/0165978.

As per claim 6, Hansen teaches the method of claim 2, Hansen fails to teach selecting a sub layer interface type further comprises the step of :

Selecting the sub-layer interface type from a group consisting of; Packet over Sonet, Asynchronous Transfer Mode, and GigEthernet.

Chui teaches selecting a sub layer interface type further comprises the step of :

Selecting the sub-layer interface type from a group consisting of; Packet over Sonet, Asynchronous Transfer Mode, and GigEthernet. (Paragraph 0201)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Chui's teaching with method of Hansen in order to provide a wide variety of access control tools that permit network managers to define the policy of how network group can interact within themselves.

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments filed on 4/26/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument focused on the following:

A) Hansen fails to teach "determining whether the local interface and next neighbor information is associated with a logical configuration link stored among a plurality of logical configuration links in a logical link database."

B) Hansen fails to teach "creating a new logical configuration link when the local interface and next neighbor information is not associated with any of the logical configuration links in the logical link database and storing the new logical configuration link in the logical link database."

C) Hansen fails to teach “selecting a link numbering type for the new logical configuration link.”

Examiner disagrees.

A) The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given >their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

In this case, Hansen teaches this limitation because it identifies the location of the configuration file, and the location could be on a local drive or on a network neighborhood. (see Hansen, column 5 ,lines 45-65) By doing that, Hansen determines whether the logical configuration links to a local database or a network database.

B) Hansen teaches this limitation because the PCI slot 3, which is not connected or associated with any logical configure, can be configured to be linked to a network device and configured according to device's information. (see Hansen, column 15 ,lines 40-60) By doing so, Hansen creates a new logical configuration on the PCI slot 3 when none existed before.

Art Unit: 2174

Furthermore, Hansen stores the newly configured script in a memory subsystem, and the memory subsystem is a database for configuration scripts. (see Hansen, column 2 ,lines 40-45)

Although the examiner has previously stated on 5/18/05,that Hansen does teach this limitation, the examiner was referring to US Patent 6,772,204, which has an inventor named Hansen. Since 10/23/06, the examiner has been referring to US Patent US 5,838,907, which also has an inventor named Hansen.

C) Hansen teaches this limitation because the new PCI is configured with desired port number and port setting. The selection of port number and setting is a selection of number link configuration.(see Hansen, col. 15, lines 40-45)

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2174

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke


KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100